



[Handwritten Signature]
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,801	08/29/2001	Yoshiro Yamaguchi	110491	4697
25944	7590	07/25/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320				DINH, DUC Q
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/940,801	YAMAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DUC Q. DINH	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office is responsive to the Amendment filed on May 4, 2006. Claims 1-18 are pending in the Application. Claims 1 and 16-18 currently amended and being examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon, II et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,184,856), hereinafter Gordon in view of Hou et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,113,810), hereinafter Hou.

In reference to claim 1, Gordon discloses an image display device comprising:
a display substrate (2) having first side and a second side;
a back substrate (4);
an electrode (20) formed on the lower side of the display substrate (2);
a spacer(24) for forming a gap between the display substrate and the back substrate;
two kinds of particles differing in (10a, 10b) sealed between the display substrate (2) and the back substrate (4) [col. 6, lines 64-66].

a filter (30,32,34) of plural colors (R, G, B) for transmitting light of a specific wavelength, wherein the filter is formed on the second side of the (the filter elements may also be located on the front surface of the front window (2), i.e.: second side of the display substrate);

Gordon does not disclose the particles are differing in charging polarity. Hou discloses in Fig. 1 the particles of a display are differing in charging polarity.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the pigments with particles with different charging polarity in the device Gordon as taught by Hou because it would provide a display device image display device with highly contrast display images (col. 2, lines 15-20 of Hou).

In reference to claim 2, Hou discloses the two particles are white and black as claimed.

In reference to claims 3-4, Hou discloses the particles white electrophoretic particles 22 and black electrophoretic particles 24 may be formed from cross linked polymer particles using a two stage dispersion polymerization technique with and without staining with a metal oxide, respectively [col.3, lines 45-55].

In reference to claim 5, Gordon discloses in Fig. 1 the substrate and the filter are integrated.

In reference to claim 6, Gordon discloses the color filter medium can, for example, be a light-transmissive colored filter element, a colored light-reflecting panel, or the pigment suspension fluid itself can be colored and serve as the color filter medium (col.3, lines 35-40).

In reference to claim 7, Gordon discloses the filter is divided into 3 regions for red, green, and blue colors (Fig. 1).

In reference to claim 8, Gordon discloses the color filer is arranged in stripes (Fig. 1)

In reference in claim 10, Gordon discloses the color filter medium selects the color reflected by each cell. The color filter medium can, for example, be a light-transmissive colored filter element disposed across the horizontal area of the cell, either above the suspension or below the suspension on top of the light-reflecting panel. An appropriately colored pigment suspension fluid, a colored light-reflecting panel, a color diffuser, or a painted surface can also serve as the color filter medium (col. 8, lines 8-18).

In reference to claim 11, Gordon discloses the filter is divided into plural chromatic region (R, G, B; see Fig. 1) and the barrier 22 as achromatic region between filters (Fig. 1).

In reference to claim 12, Gordon discloses the transparent achromatic wall 24 as claimed.

In reference to claim 13, Gordon discloses electrodes 8 and 20 as claimed.

4. Claims 14-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon and Hou as applied to claims 1-8 and 10-13 and further in view of Comiskey (U. S. Patent No. 6,376,828).

In reference to claims 14 and 15, the combination of Gordon and Hou do not discloses the irradiating for the display. Comiskey disclose and front light for an electrophoretic display for emitting white light to the inside of the display medium for the display substrate side of the image display medium (see Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the light source to illuminate the display in the combination of Gordon and Hou as taught by Comiskey for lighting the display when ambient light decreases (col. 8, lines 15-20 of Comisky).

In reference to claims 16-18, refer to the rejection as applied to claims 1 and 14-15. In addition, Comiskey discloses the light transmissive element 8 may comprise additional elements to enhance the versatility of the illuminated nonemissive electronic display 1. In one embodiment of the invention, shown in FIG. 1, a light polarizing film 16 (corresponding to the spectral means) is provided adjacent first surface 8a to increase the uniformity of light passing through the second face 8b and reaching the viewer 20. In another embodiment of the invention, a red/green/blue absorptive filter (not shown) is provided adjacent the first face 8a or second face 8b of the light transmissive element 8 to alter the wavelength of light passing through the first face 8a or second face 8b thereby creating a colored display (col. 6, line 62 – col. 7, line 6).

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon and Hou as applied to claims 1-9 above and further in view of Shirochi (U. S. Patent No. 5,872,654)

In reference to claim 9, the combination Gordon and Hou do not disclose the filter is on of the matrix mosaic type. Shirochi discloses color filters corresponding to three primary colors are placed relative to each pixel and the same color pixels are arranged having the mosaic type as claimed.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to learn the teaching of Shirochi, i.e., color filters corresponding to three primary colors are placed relative to each pixel and the same color pixels are arranged having the mosaic pattern for providing a display device in which the diffusion for more than three pixels can be easily obtained (col. 2, lines 34-37 of Shirochi).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **DUC Q. DINH** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7686**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD HJERPE** can be reached on **(571) 272-7691**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Va Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Application/Control Number: 09/940,801
Art Unit: 2629

Page 7

DUC Q DINH
Examiner
Art Unit 2629

DQQD
October 30, 2004



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600